DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 068 HE 007 931

AUTHOR Peterson, Howard L.; Weidman, John C.
TITLE A Comparative Study of Undergraduates in Three Alternative Degree Programs at the University of Minnesota.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., April 2, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Conventional Instruction; *Educational Objectives; Educational Programs; *Experimental Programs; *External Degree Programs; *Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Objectives; Self Concept Tests; *Student Characteristics; Surveys; Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

Three nontraditional study programs at the University of Minnesota provide the setting of this study to determine what kinds of persons become students in a given program and what factors make their experience in a program a successful one. A questionnaire was distributed to students in the Experimental College, the University Without Walls, and the General College. The questionnaire attempted to determine the following: (1) what kinds of students become involved in a given program; (2) the extent to which students in nontraditional programs aspire toward traditional outcomes of college education, i.e., are their educational goals and expectations markedly different from those students in traditional programs, and to what extent are they achieving their goals; (3) their post-college goals, particularly those related to their future occupation; and (4) the role interpersonal involvement with faculty and college peers plays in nontraditional programs. The study reveals significant differences between students involved in the three nontraditional programs, including their self-perception, orientation toward future occupational goals, expectations they have of their college, and the relationship they have (or wish to have) with their college. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED124068

A Comparative Study of Undergraduates in Three Alternative Degree Programs at the University of Minnesota

by

Howard L. Peterson
University of Minnesota

and

John C. Weidman
University of Minnesota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007 931

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 2, 1975.

The study described in this paper was exploratory and descriptive in nature and focused on students involved in what might be construed as non-traditional university degree granting programs. In most basic terms, non-traditional study may be defined as a set of changing educational patterns caused and defined by the changing needs and opportunities of society. This is not meant to imply new models, forms or means, but rather, new combinations and structures of forms, making for more options. While it is difficult to state a definition precisely, one can say that non-traditional study is more attitude than system. (Commission on Non-Traditional Study, 1973, page xv) According to Samuel Gould, "This attitude puts the student first and the institution second, concentrates more on the former's needs than the latter's convenience, encourages diversity of individual opportunity rather than uniform prescription, and deemphasizes time, space, and even course requirements in favor of competence and where applicable, performance. It has concern for the learner of any age and circumstance, for the degree aspirant as well as the person who finds sufficient reward in enriching life through constant, periodic or occasional study. This attitude is not new; it is simply more prevalent than it used to be." (Commission on Non-Traditional Study, 1973, page xv) In general terms, we sought to determine what kinds of persons become students in a given program and what factors make their experience in a program a successful one.

During recent years many books pointing out the need for and advocating the establishment of non-traditional forms of higher education have been published. They have signaled a recognition that there are many persons seeking higher education for whom the conventional four year degree program

is not appropriate. Of these works, perhaps the most comprehensive are the reports produced by the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, an independent research body established by the Educational Testing Service and the College Entrance Examination Board, and funded in cooperation with the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

The Commission's findings have been published in a primary report, entitled Diversity by Design (1973), and in a series of related works which treat specific aspects of non-traditional study in greater detail. These reports outline the need for diversifying the forms of higher education in order to provide access to a larger plurality of persons than is now being served by colleges and universities, and describe some existing non-traditional programs in this country and abroad. Further, they treat issues such as the forms of recognition to be accorded non-traditional study, operational models for degree programs, the problem of providing access to higher education, and the role of technology in non-traditional study. Surprisingly lacking in the literature, however, are data on students involved in non-traditional programs. As a consequence, it is difficult to determine with precision what kinds of persons are drawn to non-traditional programs, or what factors will make their experiences in a program successful: both important questions if one is involved in program development or evaluation.

In his work on student development in the Experimental College at Berkeley (The Best Laid Plans, 1972), Robert Suczek went a step beyond previous studies and focused on students involved in a non-traditional program, comparing their personal and social development with that of students in a

traditional degree program. His basic concern was to learn how development might be facilitated and enhanced in non-traditional education.

The program Suczek studied was residential in nature and designed to provide an alternative education plan for students in their first two years of college at the University of California, Berkeley. (Each of the students had elected to participate in the Experimental College.) Mixing qualitative and quantitative methodologies, Suczek tried to determine if the Experimental College attracted persons who were at a particular level of development, and how the individual's developmental state interacted with the milieu he encountered in college. Unfortunately, however, due to a narrow sampling and limited data analysis, Suczek's findings are not generalizable.

In this study, we chose to take a more general look at students in non-traditional programs than was attempted by Suczek. First, we attempted to determine what kinds of students become involved in a given program. Are they, for example, the radical left that is typically thought to make up the student body in experimental and alternative education programs? Are they greatly dissatisfied with the present state of higher education? Are they from highly educated, wealthy families? Do they see themselves as highly capable, self-directed persons?

Second, we wanted to determine the extent to which students in non-traditional programs aspire toward traditional outcomes of college education, including skills and training for an occupation, general liberal arts education, communications skills, and moral-spiritual development. In short, we wanted to find out if their educational goals and expectations were markedly different from those of students in traditional higher education

programs, and to what extent they achieved their goals.

Third, we wanted to determine some of their post-college goals, particularly those related to their future occupation. These goals included having financial security, being a leader in their community, and using their creative and intellectual abilities.

Fourth, and last, we wanted to determine the role interpersonal involvement with faculty and college peers plays in non-traditional programs. This was particularly interesting, because in many programs great emphasis is placed on maximizing the frequency and quality of such interaction. Indeed, many persons involved in non-traditional programs feel that a high degree of student-faculty interaction is fundamentally necessary if students are to 'succeed' in their programs. According to Chickering (1969):

> When student-faculty interaction is frequent and friendly, and when it occurs in diverse situations calling for varied roles, development of intellectual competence, autonomy, and purpose are fostered.

Many non-traditional programs, however, are basically non-residential in nature (notably the external degree programs) and, presumably afford few opportunities for direct student-faculty interaction. On the basis of Chickering's statement, one might be led to conclude that students in non-residential programs are less likely to perceive their experience in such programs favorably than students in residential programs with a high degree of interaction. One obvious explanation of this anomaly is that students are drawn to programs which provide the level of interpersonal involvement they seek.

For the purpose of this study we chose to not explore this hypothesis,

but rather, sought to determine the extent of student-faculty interaction and the extent to which students interacted and were personally involved with their college peers.

THE PROGRAMS

Data for the research were obtained from questionnaires distributed to students enrolled during spring term, 1973, in three non-traditional programs at the University of Minnesota: the Experimental College, the University Without Walls, and the General College. These programs were selected because administrators were anxious to update their information on students in their programs and had agreed to assist the researcher in gathering data for the study. Further, two of the programs (University Without Walls and Experimental College) were small enough so that questionnaires could be distributed to every student. While each fits the definition of a non-traditional program, they are, in many basic ways, quite different.

University Without Walls

The University Without Walls (UWW) is a diverse, nationwide network of external degree programs coordinated by the Union for Experimental Colleges at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. The University Without Walls program at the University of Minnesota began operating in September of 1971, with a primary goal of providing a degree program for students with clear educational objectives which could not be realized through conventional programs of higher education. Selective in admitting students to its program, UWW seeks the

> mature, self-directed student with clear educational goals who cannot reach them because some barrier exists. . . . Included in this group might be the housewife/mother of young children, the farmer whose job requirements keep him at home, the prisoner, the handicapped person or the person having a high degree of experience in a certain field, but who lacks the degree that could mean promotion or new employment.
> (UWW recruitment brochure)

UWW provides education for persons at work, at home, or "wherever they may be," and faculty are drawn from both inside and outside the academic world. Strong emphasis is placed upon self-directed learning.

There is no set time limit for completing a degree program, nor is there a fixed curriculum. Every program is tailored to fit the needs of the student and is worked out by the student and his teacher-advisor. Most UWW students have had some previous college experience. The average age of students is 34 years.

Experimental College

The Experimental College (EC) was founded as a result of the "recognition by many students, faculty, and administrators that the University does not . . . respond adequately to many educational aspirations, and that new directions need to be sought." They proposed that a college be established that would be devoted to experimentation and would provide "a model for undergraduate education aimed at students who wish to create their own program and participate in the governance of their college." Among its goals, EC seeks to

> create a cooperative community of scholars;

> explore new student-teacher relationships;
>
> find ways of overcoming oppressive group dynamics;
>
> improve communications skills and self-expression;
>
> become aware of the social consequences and responsibilities of knowledge and scholarship;
>
> foster intellectual, social, emotional, and spiritual growth.
> (Experimental College proposal)

While the EC accepts applications for admission from any interested person, admission to the college is determined by a committee comprised of staff and students. The admissions committee seeks those persons who are likely to contribute to EC's goals and persons interested in joining EC are required to meet with the committee several times during the quarter prior to admission.

General College

Founded in 1932, the General College (GC) is the oldest of the non-traditional programs at the University of Minnesota. It took as its task the providing of "general education and job training at the college level to ready . . . (students) to cope with their changing, modern, exciting, difficult world." (MacLean, 1962) A fundamental assumption in the GC, then and now, is that the first year of college is especially crucial to a student in his search for identity.

> He is faced with hourly decisions as to career and preparation for it. And beyond these he seeks to know himself as a biological and social animal, as friend, lover, son, husband, parent, worker, citizen. He needs to discover and rediscover his reason for

> existence, his purposes, his own pattern of intelligences, abilities, interests, skills. General education, well wrought, well taught, rooted in counseling, is clearly one of the most effective means yet devised to help students in this search.
> (MacLean, 1962)

Many persons not familiar with the General College might well question the extent to which it may be viewed as a 'non-traditional' program. The facts are that the GC has been operating on a multiversity concept for over forty-two years, opening its doors to

> . . .the poor, minorities, women; those who think they lack ability to do college work, those who missed one chance at college and seek another, those who once found college uncongenial or uncompromising, but who want to try it again, and those who want to cap with degrees (perhaps in unconventional fields), education obtained in such alternatives to traditional systems as the armed forces; proprietary schools; training programs maintained by business, industry, or the civil service; or paraprofessional experience in health, welfare, recreation, corrections, or law enforcement agencies.
> (MacLean, 1962)

Further, the GC seeks to improve teaching in college classrooms, to provide community programs that meet the needs of the community, and to provide innovative course work and programs responsive to the needs of University students. In recent years, for example, the GC has been the home of such new projects as New Careers, Work Incentive Program, Newgate, Career Opportunity, Upward Bound, Careers in Urban Planning, the Help Center, and the Martin Luther King Scholarship Program.

The General College is open to any Minnesotan who has completed a high school education and, under certain circumstances, to persons who haven't

done so. Any person admitted is free to "progress within the University as far as academic ability, classroom performance, personal circumstances, and interest in higher education allow." (MacLean, 1962) In addition to offering a general education program, the General College offers (in conjunction with other schools in the University) occupational education. Active programs now include dental assisting, law enforcement, legal paraprofessional education, marketing, radiologic technology, and others.

The general structural differences among the three programs are summarized in Chart 1. As stated previously, the UWW and the EC have a selective admissions policy. One might conclude, therefore, that each of these programs would have a relatively homogeneous student body, one which reflects the goals and aspirations of the program. Conversely, one would expect the GC, with an open door admissions policy, to have a highly diverse student population.

Since each of the programs sees itself as innovative and experimental, as a radical departure from traditional forms of higher education in America, one would expect that the students in all three programs would be more oriented toward autonomy and self-direction in the process of education, and that this would be reflected in their educational expectations, needs and goals.

In more specific terms, one would expect that the Experimental College students would be least conventional and would display a high degree of unwillingness to be limited by organizational constraints. Further, given the EC's emphasis on interpersonal communication and cooperative decision

making, one would expect EC students to place high value on student-staff interaction and participation in academic governance. Last, considering the emphasis EC places on self-expression and personal growth, it seems likely that EC students would be particularly concerned with their own development.

Of the three programs, the UWW is unique in that it is the only external degree program at the University. Students in UWW are given the freedom and responsibility to develop their own educational program. One might expect, therefore, that UWW students would tend to be more autonomous, more self-directed than students in the other programs. Moreover, prior to admission, the UWW student must know, in specific terms, what his educational objectives are. It seems that this condition of acceptance increases the likelihood that the UWW student has formulated his occupational objectives in fairly specific terms. If this is so, it should be reflected in the student's orientation toward acquiring specific skill for an occupation, as opposed to a general education.

Because of the seeming diversity of the population, it is difficult to generate expectations about students in the General College. In very general terms, one would expect the GC student population to be more heterogeneous than those of the UWW and the EC. Furthermore, given the open admissions policy, one might expect to find a substantial number of students from low socio-economic strata and students who might be conventionally described as average. Also, one might expect to find at least two distinct orientations among GC students: those students seeking a general education and those students seeking a more highly specialized occupational education.

STUDY DESIGN

A total of two hundred questionnaires were distributed to students in the three programs and one hundred and fifty-one usable ones were returned, an overall response rate of 75 percent. Because of the relatively small student populations in the University Without Walls and the Experimental College, it was possible to distribute questionnaires to every student enrolled in these programs during spring quarter, 1973. Of the 100 questionnaires distributed to UWW students, 61% were returned. Twenty-six of the 36 questionnaires distributed to EC students were returned, or a response rate of 72%. Questionnaires were also distributed to 64 students enrolled in two General College courses, whose instructors had indicated a willingness to take part in the study. Sixty-four usable questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 100%.

Questionnaire items were drawn from two national surveys (Astin, et. al., 1967 and Trow, et. al., 1972). Data were analyzed using cross-tabular analysis to assess differences and similarities among students in the three programs.

FINDINGS

In reading the following, it should be kept in mind that while this study compares students involved in three non-traditional degree programs at the University of Minnesota, the comparison was not made for the purpose of being able to say that one program is more (or less) "successful" than the other programs. As was explained earlier, each of the programs described in this study differs from the others in some fundamental ways, and, to a large extent, their goals and means for achieving those goals are different.

Student Educational Expectations, Student-Faculty Interaction

Significant differences were found between students in the three programs regarding what they expected from college. For example, Table 1 shows comparisons of students' orientations toward obtaining a detailed grasp of a special field by program.

Table 1 suggests that EC students are less oriented toward highly specialized education than students in UWW and the GC. For example, approximately 19% of the EC students said that obtaining a detailed grasp of a special field was not important to them, compared to approximately 3% of the GC and UWW students who gave this response. These findings are further supported by the data presented in Table 2, student expectations of receiving training and skills for an occupation. Again, EC students are far less likely to be oriented toward this type of specialized education than students in the GC and the UWW. Over 34% of the EC students, for example, stated that this type of training was not important to them.

Table 3 indicates that there is a significant difference by program in students' orientations toward learning to get along with others and suggests that students in UWW are less concerned with obtaining this traditional educational outcome than are students in the other programs. This might be due, in part, to the fact that UWW students are typically older than students in the other programs, many are married and have been working for several years. For many of these persons, a college degree represents advancement in their jobs or the credentials necessary for new employment.

There were, however, two areas in which students in the three programs expressed similar needs. Tables 4 and 5 indicate that students in all three

programs show strong concern for obtaining a well-rounded education and for formulating life values and goals.

Students in each program were also asked to indicate to what extent their expectations with respect to each of the foregoing five goals had been met. In comparing what students expected to get from their college experience with what they perceive themselves to have received, some substantial disparities appear. Students in all three programs indicated that their expectations had not been met with respect to the gaining of "a detailed grasp of a special field." Only UWW students had their expectations met with respect to obtaining "a well-rounded education." Only General College students had their expectations met with respect to "formulating life goals and values."

Both Experimental College and UWW students indicated that their expectations had been met with respect to obtaining "training and skills for an occupation." That the expectations of General College students for this particular goal were not met is something of an anomaly, since the General College program is the only one of the three programs studies that does actually provide formal vocational training for students.

With respect to "learning to get along with people," students in both Experimental College and General College indicated that their expectations had been met by their programs. That UWW students did not have their expectations met for this goal seems quite understandable since most of their study takes place away from the campus. It is interesting to note, however, that almost half of the UWW students indicated that this goal was "essential," despite the fact that, virtually by definition, an external degree program

greatly restricts interaction with other students and with faculty other than the primary adviser.

As Table 6 shows, however, UWW students did not report the lowest levels of interaction with faculty in their major program. Most notable was the relative lack of interaction between students of the GC and their major faculty. This is especially difficult to understand, given the emphasis the GC places upon student-teacher interaction. Also, the figures for the EC students, while having the highest mean of the three programs, might be viewed as low for a program that prides itself on a high degree of student-staff interaction and on exploring new forms of student-teacher relationships. Interesting, also, is that for the most part the close friends of the students in all three programs are non-college students. This suggests that the students interact relatively infrequently with their college peers.

Orientation Toward Educational Change, Participation in Academic Governance, Social Liberalism

Table 7, Part A, indicates the percentage of persons, by program, who agreed with each item.

In evaluating the students' orientations toward educational change, it is most interesting to look at the extremes. On these items, EC students were much more likely to advocate drastic educational change than their peers in the UWW and the GC. This orientation toward educational change is consistent with the EC's operating philosophy, which is, in brief, to furnish students with options to traditional educational forms. The GC students, on the other hand, were consistently more conservative about educational

change than students in the other two programs.

The general conservative orientation of students in the GC and UWW (and the implied liberalism of the EC students) in regard to educational change is reflected in their orientation toward participation in academic governance. The figures given in Table 7, Part B, are the percentages of persons, by program, who favor students having a high degree of control over the facet of governance cited in each item. Particularly striking is that, almost without exception, the EC students surveyed indicated that undergraduates should have a high degree of control over faculty and student matters. However, a much smaller percentage of UWW and GC students felt undergraduates should have a high degree of control over areas such as faculty appointment, promotion and tenure, undergraduate admission policy, and B.A. requirements.

Student responses to items concerning political and social attitudes are shown, by program, in Table 8. Again, these data suggest that UWW and GC students have a significantly greater conservative orientation than their peers in the EC.

Students' Future Goals

The figures given in Table 9 are the percentages of students in each program who indicated that the item was of "high" importance as a future goal.

In general terms, students in the UWW and GC are more likely to seek conventional occupational goals than are students in the EC. Further, it indicates that UWW students are more likely to aspire to leadership roles

than students in the EC and the GC. This impression is reinforced by student responses to goals and values which relate to occupations. Some interesting things are suggested by the data. First, one is impressed by the responses of EC students to those items dealing with creative behavior; they are much more likely to be concerned with having creative outlets in their life than are their peers in the UWW and GC. Second, and perhaps just as striking, is the premium placed on some traditional academic goals ("becoming an authority . . . ." and "obtaining recognition . . . .") by students in UWW. Third, both UWW and GC students were more likely to place a high level of importance on leadership roles than students in the EC. Fourth, and last, students in the EC appear to be much more concerned with influencing the political structure and social values than their peers in the other programs.

DISCUSSION

This study revealed that there are some very significant differences between students involved in the three non-traditional programs at the University of Minnesota. These differences include students' self-perception, orientation toward future occupational goals, expectations they have of their college, and the relationship they have (or wish to have) with their college.

General College

The General College respondents distinguished themselves by their poor self-image. For example, on a wide range of social, physical, and mental attributes, the General College student was much more likely to rank himself lower than his peers in the University Without Walls or Experimental College. Of the three attributes on which the General College student ranked

higher than his peers in the other programs, athletic ability, mechanical ability, and political conservatism, none are particularly valued in traditional academic settings. It seems likely that this negative image is related to the General College structure. As stated previously, many students who would not otherwise meet the criteria for admission enter the University through the General College's open door admissions policy. In many cases, these are persons with average ability who haven't distinguished themselves academically. It seems reasonable, therefore, that their self-image would show less academic self-confidence than their peers in programs with a much more selective admissions policy.

The highly negative self-image General College students have of themselves is exacerbated by the negative image they have of their college. This was made even more explicit in their written comments on the questionnaire. Many students, for example, expressed great concern that the General College is thought to be a place where "even dumb people can get a degree". Several students even went so far as to suggest ways in which the stigma attached to being a General College student might be lessened.

It would be interesting and worthwhile to examine how General College students cope with the general definition of their college as a place for inferior people--"a school for dummies". For example, one might try to determine if the General College staff assists the student in any formal, explicit way to deal with this problem. Further, since the negative reputation of the General College seems rather pervasive, future research might be focused on the extent to which the General College staff shares with the student a negative self-image, either on a personal or professional level,

and how they cope with this image.

The data also revealed that there exists for the General College student a substantial disparity between what they expected to get from their college and what they perceive themselves to be receiving. For example, the General College students sampled put a high priority on acquiring training and skills for an occupation; a detailed grasp of a special field; human relations skills ("learning to get along with others", etc.); and life values and goals. A high percentage of General College students indicated that they had received little training or help in these areas, and that their perceived gains were smaller than expected.

It is difficult to account for this disparity between expectation and outcome, particularly in view of the fact that the General College has a wide range of occupational programs offering comprehensive, high quality training, that it emphasizes developing human relations skills and life values and goals through education. In general terms, these findings suggest that there is a need for more or better dialogue between the General College staff and students, focused on these areas of concern. Having a large percentage of persons with goals that are not being met can only be dysfunctional for a program.

The data also suggests that General College students have a low level of involvement with their peers and their teachers, that they interact only infrequently with persons associated with the General College, and, for the most part, their close friends are non-college students. It may be that this low level of interaction may be related to their poor self-image and the negative image they have of their college and the persons associated

with it. (However, it seems more likely due to the fact that the majority of students in General College are commuters who come to the University only for their classes.) The thing that is important, it seems to us, is that the General College puts a high value on frequent and substantive student-teacher interaction and sees its education program as being "rooted" in good counseling. There is cause for concern, therefore, when a high percentage of students indicate they seldom interact with their teachers or their fellow students.

Experimental College

The student respondents from the Experimental College distinguished themselves from their peers in the University Without Walls and the General College in several interesting ways, with perhaps the most striking contrasts to be drawn from their responses to items on the self-concept scale.

In general terms, the Experimental College respondents saw themselves as being more intelligent and more creative than most students their age. Their future orientation and occupational goals seem to further reflect their interest in being creative, dynamic persons. For the most part, the Experimental College student eschewed conventional values; they are not concerned with wealth or security. They are, however, greatly concerned with "becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts, writing original works of literature, and creating artistic works".

Students in each of the programs indicated that they expected a well-rounded education from their college. However, the Experimental College students were significantly more likely to indicate that they hadn't received

a well-rounded education than their peers in the University Without Walls and the General College. One possible explanation for this is that the General College degree program is designed to provide the student a well-rounded education and students are required to complete coursework in several academic areas. This is not the case in Experimental College, however.

While the data show that Experimental College students tend to interact more frequently with faculty members than do students in the General College, there appears to be a substantial percentage of Experimental College students who interact seldom (if at all) with their teachers. This is especially difficult to understand, given the emphasis the Experimental College places on student-staff interaction, on exploring new forms of student-teacher relationships.

As was stated previously, Experimental College students tend to be much more oriented toward educational and social change than students in other programs and tend to be more liberal than their peers in their stands on social issues. In their responses to this survey, they indicated a strong need to influence the political structure and social issues. However, this is not too surprising, since the Experimental College deliberately seeks persons who are liberal in this thinking and change oriented. What is surprising is that one-half of the Experimental College students surveyed indicated that there is little a person can do to bring about change within our society. It would be interesting to determine how these students reconcile this disparity.

University Without Walls

In general terms, the University Without Walls students fell between

the General College and Experimental College students on several variables. For example, like their peers in General College, University Without Walls students have a basic conservative orientation, but unlike students in the General College, the University Without Walls student is prone to take an active role in society. University Without Walls students tend to see themselves as capable persons, however their "capabilities" don't cluster as tightly as those of the Experimental College students. University Without Walls students are oriented toward certain traditional outcomes of college and there doesn't seem to be much disparity between what they want from the University Without Walls and what they perceive themselves to be getting.

University Without Walls students tend to not be concerned with participation in student governance and academic affairs and seem to prefer to leave these matters to the University Without Walls administration. This orientation seems to be in conflict with the University Without Walls' emphasis on students carrying out functions traditionally left to college administration, such as program planning, evaluation, etc. However, further research is needed to determine if this conflict is more real than imagined.

A few concluding observations suggest that even in non-traditional college programs, the person-program match is far from perfect. First, each of the programs discussed have a rather substantial percentage of persons with needs and goals that are not, for one reason or another, being met by their college. Second, approximately one-half of the students in each program indicated that much of what they are doing and learning in their college is irrelevant to what they perceive to be going on in the outside world. Finally, a fairly high percentage of persons in each program have indicated

that they are not satisfied with their college.

While we do not expect others to be able to generalize from these comparisons among students in three non-traditional undergraduate programs on one campus, it is our hope that this study might provide a point of departure, both for future research and for programmatic planning.

References

Astin, Alexander W. et. al. "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen - Fall, 1966." American Council on Education Research Reports, II (No. 3, 1967).

Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Commission on Non-Traditional Study. Diversity by Design. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Experimental College. Proposal Made to the University College Governing Council, 1971.

MacLean, Malcolm S. "The Exciting Early Years of the General College." The General College Newsletter, Vol. 9, No. 3, June, 1962.

Suczek, Robert F. The Best Laid Plans. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Trow, Martin et. al. Technical Report: Carnegie Commission National Survey of Higher Education. mimeo copy. Berkeley, California: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1972.

University Without Walls. "Recruitment Brochure," mimeo copy. University of Minnesota, 1973.

Chart 1

STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES AMONG PROGRAMS*

	Experimental College	University Without Walls	General College
1. Selective Admissions	Yes	Yes	No
2. Students take regular University courses	optional	optional	Yes
3. External Degree	No	Yes	No
4. Vocational/ Occupational Preparation	No	No	Yes
5. General/ Specialized Occupational Preparation	optional	optional	general
6. Student Designed Program	Yes	Yes	optional

*Selective admissions, item one, refers to whether applicants must meet certain entrance criteria stipulated by the program. Item two refers to whether students may (or are required to) take regular University classroom courses. Item three indicates if students may obtain a baccaulaureate degree from the program without being in continuous residence at the University. Item four indicates whether or not the program formally provides vocational and/or occupational training for students. Item five indicates whether students may pursue general or specialized occupational preparation. Item six indicates whether or not the student may design his or her own program.

Table 1

Student Educational Expectations by Program

Detailed Grasp of a Special Field
(Per Cent)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)
Essential	56	42	39
Important	41	55	42
Not Important	3	3	19

$x^2 = 12.4$, $p = .01$

Table 2

Student Educational Expectations by Program

Training and Skills for an Occupation
(Per Cent)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)
Essential	36	50	27
Important	54	39	39
Not Important	10	11	35

$X^2 = 13.4$, $p = .01$

Table 3

Student Educational Expectations by Program

Learning to Get Along With Others
(Per Cent)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)
Essential	49	67	65
Important	36	31	35
Not Important	15	2	0

$x^2 = 12.4, p = .01$

Table 4

Student Educational Expectations by Program

Well-Rounded Education
(Per Cent)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)
Essential	61	65	57
Important	29	30	35
Not Important	10	5	8

$x^2 = 1.5$, $p = .81$

Table 5

Student Educational Expectations by Program

Formulating Life Goals and Values
(Per Cent)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=61)	Experimental College (N=26)
Essential	54	55	58
Important	34	34	31
Not Important	11	11	11

$X^2 = .14$, $p = 1.0$

Table 6

Student-Major Faculty Interaction

(Per Cent)*

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)	
Often discuss topics in his/her field	51	30	58	$x^2 = 8.436$ $p = .0147$
Often discuss other topics of intellectual interest	43	28	61	$x^2 = 8.976$ $p = .0112$
Sometimes engage in social conversation	59	53	73	$x^2 = 4.363$ $p = .1128$
Ever talk about personal matters	44	31	69	$x^2 = 10.94$ $p = .004$

*note: Reporting "yes" responses. "No" percentage = 100% - "yes"%.

Table 7

Orientations Toward Educational Change and Student Participation in Academic Governance

(Per Cent Desiring)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)	
A. Educational Change				
All courses elective	54	73	92	$x^2 = 13.493$ $p = .0012$
Grades abolished	69	58	96	$x^2 = 12.678$ $p = .0018$
Courses more relevant to contemporary life and problems	98	94	100	$x^2 = 3.149$ $p = .207$
More attention paid to emotional growth of students	92	86	100	$x^2 = 4.48$ $p = .106$
B. Participation in Academic Governance				
Faculty appointment, promotion, tenure	43	41	96	$x^2 = 9.707$ $p = .007$
Undergraduate admission policy	49	60	96	$x^2 = 9.804$ $p = .007$
B.A. requirement	49	52	92	$x^2 = 4.99$ $p = .05$
Provision and content of courses	51	52	92	$x^2 = 7.89$ $p = .02$

Table 8

Social Liberalism

(Per Cent Agree)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)	
Student publications should be cleared by college officials	26	26	4	$x^2 = 6.3$ $p = .05$
Students who ... disrupt ... should be expelled or suspended	51	41	11	$x^2 = 11.79$ $p = .0028$
These days you hear too much about the rights of minorities and not enough about the rights of the majority	36	48	4	$x^2 = 16.0$ $p = .0003$
Most people who live in poverty could do something about their situation if they really wanted to	33	42	15	$x^2 = 5.99$ $p = .05$
Any special academic program for black students should be administered and controlled by black people	66	48	88	$x^2 = 13.08$ $p = .001$
College officials should ban persons with extreme views from speaking on campus	7	8	11	$x^2 = .62$ $p = .733$

Table 9

Students' Future Goals

(Per Cent of Students Rating Goal As Essential or Very Important)

	University Without Walls (N=61)	General College (N=64)	Experimental College (N=26)	
Stable, secure future	44	64	11	$x^2 = 20.78$ $p = .05$
Opportunity to be original and creative	93	86	96	$x^2 = 3.19$ $p = .203$
A chance to exercise leadership	67	56	26	$x^2 = 12.006$ $p = .002$
Living and working in the world of ideas	89	72	81	$x^2 = 5.44$ $p = .06$
Avoiding high pressure job	39	61	61	$x^2 = 6.90$ $p = .03$
Becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts	18	19	62	$x^2 = 20.91$ $p = .05$
Writing original works of literature	38	28	61	$x^2 = 8.78$ $p = .012$
Creating artistic works	36	36	77	$x^2 = 14.70$ $p = .006$
Obtaining recognition from my colleagues . . . in my special field	59	34	31	$x^2 = 9.84$ $p = .007$
Having administrative responsibility for the work of others	28	23	4	$x^2 = 6.32$ $p = .05$
Influencing the political structure	38	12	50	$x^2 = 16.22$ $p = .0003$
Influencing social values	74	48	81	$x^2 = 16.84$ $p = .002$